



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

always haunting his imagination. But here, too, the enterprise would be conspicuously absurd. To attempt to put on the Pacific a navy sufficiently superior to those of all the other powers, or even of any one of the great naval powers, to enable us to dominate the ocean in any way that would interfere with the rights of others, would be to attempt a most impossible task. England has tried that game a good while in the other hemisphere, but the only result has been to put her into deeper and ever deeper anxiety the bigger and more burdensome her navy grows. If our nation should attempt to become "great" in this way, it would indeed be a heavy price in more senses than one which she would have to pay for "greatness," and she might well forgive herself in advance for being a little "craven" before entering upon a course at whose end loomed huge and terrible failure.

Whatever may have been the meaning of this remarkable oracular utterance of the President, it and others of like tenor have been most regrettable. Mr. Roosevelt says so many sensible and noble things about the country and its interests and duties, that one dislikes to see them largely nullified by the deadening effect of so much impulsive talk about the "civilizing" virtues of a big navy and about a type of "greatness" which has in history proved itself always false and ruinous.

A friend writes us from San Francisco — what we already had ample reason to believe — that the influence of the President and his party on the Pacific coast, with bold speeches of warriors at the banquets and the militaristic utterances of preachers in their pulpits on Sunday, has been anything but in the interests of peace and international good-will, which Mr. Roosevelt had been so splendidly commending before he got out of the Middle West. The friend who writes describes the presence and speeches of the President and his party, with the parades and banquets, as a veritable *boom* for militarism.

The seeming insinuations and covert challenges of the President's speech, of which we have been treating, have produced no additional respect and admiration for our country across the Atlantic, if one may judge from the character of many of the comments that have been made in the European press. Covert disregard and menacing of other nations is even worse than open criticism and disrespect. All the great naval powers will hereafter keep a keener and more suspicious eye on the "greatest of the oceans" than they did before the President spoke.

We do not mean to charge the Chief Magistrate of the nation with having intended to make threats against the public rights of other countries; but a President, of all men, ought to be the first to "abstain from every appearance of evil," in matters where inconsiderate utterances may produce such world-wide and lasting mischief.

## The Ninth Lake Mohonk Arbitration Conference.

Scarcely any better evidence could be found of the rapid progress of interest in the question of arbitration than the development of the Lake Mohonk Conference, the ninth annual meeting of which was held the last week in May.

The first meeting of the Conference took place in 1895, and was attended by only about sixty-five persons. But few of the men in that first conference had any strong hope of an early large triumph of the principle which they had been called together to discuss. Very able speeches were made, but they were largely from the idealistic point of view. The knowledge which most of the speakers had of what had already been accomplished in the practical work of arbitrating disputes was very meagre. Many of those who came were very timid about connecting themselves in any pronounced way with the movement. They little suspected how ripe the times were.

This year the number in attendance ran up to nearly two hundred and fifty, the proportion of those having accepted Mr. Smiley's invitation being much larger than in former years. The enthusiasm among the guests was also on the whole greater than we have ever before observed in the Conference. This was not due to the superior character of the addresses, for the speaking, though some of it was of unsurpassed quality, was not in the aggregate any better, if as good, as in some former years. It was due to the increased power of the movement, which everybody seemed to feel.

The Conference was presided over by Hon. John W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State, whose opening address touching some of the facts of arbitration during the year was very interesting and effective. Particularly illuminating and encouraging was his exposition and interpretation of the treaties of arbitration and disarmament between Chile and the Argentine Republic.

The main address of the Conference, if one may make selection, was that of Mr. Penfield, Solicitor of the Department of State, on the Pious Fund Arbitration, for which he had acted as agent for the United States. His exposition of the operation of the Court at the inauguration of its practical work and his interpretation of the bearings of this first case made a great impression on the Conference, and left no doubt in the minds of any that the Hague Court is to exert a power in the world of vast significance.

The other speakers were Dr. Hale, Dr. E. D. Burr, Dr. P. S. Moxom, Dr. B. F. Trueblood, Mr. H. B. F. McFarland of Washington, President Faunce, Edwin D. Mead, Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, A. Maurice Low, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Professor Braque of Vassar, Hon. Everett P. Wheeler, Hon. S. J. Barrows, Dr. Brown of the Presbyterian Mission Board,

Dr. Josiah Strong, Prof. George Grafton Wilson of Brown, Professor Fagnani of Union Seminary, Consul General Uchida of Japan, Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Col. Barnes, Rear Admiral Barker, Mr. Meakin from England, Mr. Higgins of the New York Chamber of Commerce, John Field, ex-postmaster of Philadelphia, Hon. William J. Coombs, Mr. Virginius Newton of Richmond, Va., Hon. John I. Gilbert, John B. Garrett, Mr. Holden of Detroit, Dr. Cuyler, Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins, and Miss Sarah F. Smiley.

This extraordinary array of speakers bears witness to the strength of the Mohonk work. A few of the speeches were much marred by an overplus of storytelling and side encomiums upon things having no proper place in an arbitration conference, and some by the time limit. It would be better if next year the program were not made so extended. Some of the speeches were as fine as we have ever heard at Mohonk, and we hope to give our readers an opportunity to read them during the coming months.

The subjects particularly dwelt upon were the successful inauguration of the Hague Court, the general progress of arbitration during the past year, the relations of commerce and industry to arbitration and peace, the methods of influencing public opinion, and the importance of securing special treaties of arbitration between nations pledging the reference of their controversies to the Hague Court.

The immense value of Mr. Smiley's generous and hospitable work for the cause of international concord was never more apparent than at this last Conference.

The platform adopted at the closing session of the Conference is as follows:

#### **Platform of the Ninth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.**

The principle of international arbitration has secured the approval of the civilized world. This fact is solemnly recorded by the Hague Convention.

It is gratifying to state that, largely through the influence and example of the United States, which had so much to do with the success of the Hague Conference, prestige has been given to the Hague Tribunal by the submission to it of international differences. This Conference thanks our government for what it has done in this behalf, especially in the recent Venezuelan controversy, when its efforts averted war.

This Conference believes that the next step in the steady march forward should be the conclusion of a treaty of obligatory arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, to be followed by similar agreements between the other signatory nations to the Hague Convention, to refer disputes to the Hague Tribunal. Such treaties would make the present implied obligations of the nations signing them explicit, binding and permanent, instead of leaving them, as now, under the Hague Convention, voluntary, and to be determined from time to time, and largely by circum-

stances. This Conference believes that the best public opinion of the United States and Great Britain, neighbors and kinsfolk as they are, recognizes the wisdom and justice of such an arrangement; and that the example thus set would be followed speedily by the other powers. It would lead all the nations to the Hague Tribunal.

With a deep sense of the fatherhood of God and the consequent brotherhood of man, the Conference looks forward to new victories for its cause even more remarkable than those already won, notwithstanding the difficulties in the way of extending the application of international arbitration.

Many motives may inspire arbitration,—fear, horror of war, dread of expense,—but justice is the only safe foundation for the world's peace.

In the Alaskan boundary dispute, who should not prefer that justice should prevail even if we make no gain of hills and harbors? America should conduct its claim with such loyalty to justice as to win the honor of the nations.

This Conference summons all possible agencies to teach and preach the gospel of justice. Business men and great corporations, teachers in schools, ministers of God, the public press—let our whole country accept the great motto and seek to live up to it: "America loves Justice." It appeals to every man and woman to aid in increasing and organizing the general sentiment in favor of international arbitration so as to secure, by the invincible power of public opinion, the employment of it in the maximum number of possible cases, in the hope that wars may cease and that peace may prevail.

### **Editorial Notes.**

*Leslie's Weekly*, commenting on the American Peace Society's move for a stated international congress, speaks as follows:

International Congress.

"The proposition thus made is not a new one, and it will probably be regarded by many now, as it has been in the past, as chimerical and quite outside the range of present achievement. But why it should thus be regarded we fail to see. The Peace Society has a strong and stubborn argument in behalf of its proposal in the long list of international congresses and conferences which have been held in the past seventy years, most of which have been effective and successful in the purposes set before them. Twenty-seven such bodies are named, beginning with the Congress of Vienna in 1815, which adjusted the questions left by the Napoleonic campaigns, and closing with the Pan-American Conference held in Mexico City in 1901. The United States had representatives in twelve of these international conferences, including the International Monetary Conference at Paris in 1878 and the Prime Meridian Conference at Washington in 1885; three have been called together on its initiative and four have been held at our national capital.

"It is argued very justly that the step from the organization and holding of such international conferences as those named to the formation of a regularly constituted world-congress meeting every five or seven years is a clearly logical step and one which should now be taken.